

STATINTL

Helms Says Dodd Conferred With C.I.A. Before Europe Trip

By E. W. KENWORTHY
Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, July 26—In a letter to the Senate ethics committee, the director of the Central Intelligence Agency has said that Senator Thomas J. Dodd conferred with the agency about the case of Bogdan N. Stashinsky before and after his trip to Germany in April, 1964.

In the letter to Senator John Stennis, Democrat of Mississippi, chairman of the committee, Richard Helms, the Director of Central Intelligence, also said that Senator Dodd discussed the case while he was in Germany with "our field representative" in Bonn.

In testimony before the ethics committee on June 27, Senator Dodd said he had gone to Germany "for the sole purpose" of interviewing Stashinsky, a confessed Soviet agent and murderer, and Dr. Heinrich Jagusch, judge of the German Supreme Court, who presided at his trial in October, 1962.

Mr. Dodd denied charges by the columnists Drew Pearson and Jack Anderson that he had gone to West Germany to help Julius Klein, head of a Chicago public relations firm, "hang onto clients."

The Connecticut Democrat said the committee that while he

"was anxious to do anything I could to help" Mr. Klein straighten out trouble with his clients, he did not regard this as his "mission."

The ethics committee—the Select Committee on Standards and Conduct—has been inquiring into the charges of Mr. Anderson and Mr. Pearson.

In releasing the letter from Mr. Helms today, Senator Stennis said it was handed to him on July 14 by "a representative of the C.I.A. who stated that it was in response to inquiries made by Senator Dodd."

Mr. Stennis said he had assumed Mr. Dodd's attorney would offer the letter in evidence at the next meeting of the committee, on July 19, when Mr. Klein testified.

A Study of Murder

But, Mr. Stennis said, John F. Sonnett, Senator Dodd's counsel, offered it at the very end of the hearing, and as a result the committee's members and its counsel, Benjamin R. Fern, did not have opportunity to inspect the letter. The question of admissibility was deferred until the next meeting of the committee.

Mr. Stennis added that he would recommend that the letter be admitted into evidence.

Mr. Helms wrote to Mr. Stennis that Mr. Dodd had asked him to "confirm the fact of his contacts" with the C.I.A. in obtaining "information on Soviet murders, assassinations and kidnapping" in connection with a study by the Internal Security Subcommittee.

This study, which was largely based on the Stashinsky case, was issued in October, 1965, under the title "Murder International, Inc." Mr. Dodd is vice chairman of the Internal Security Subcommittee.

Sharp Questioning

Mr. Helms wrote that Mr. Dodd and his assistant, David Martin, were in contact with the C.I.A. before and after the trip. The C.I.A. provided "certain background material" on the Stashinsky case, Mr. Helms said, "since a great deal of information about the case was a matter of record and could be made public."

During his testimony, Mr. Dodd said nothing about contacts with the C.I.A. But Mr. Martin, who accompanied him on the trip, testified that he and the Senator "had substantial contact."

In the ethics committee hearing on June 27, Senator Stennis and the committee's vice chair-

man, Wallace F. Bennett, Republican of Utah, questioned Mr. Dodd sharply.

Mr. Stennis brought out that the Stashinsky trial had occurred 17 months before Mr. Dodd's trip; that Stashinsky's crimes had been fully reported a month before the trial in an article in Life magazine; that the report, "Murder International, Inc.," was not made until Oct. 29, 1965, 18 months after the trip; that Mr. Dodd's comments on the case filled only two and a half pages and that the bulk of the report was a reprint of the court's verdict and opinion in the Stashinsky case, which Mr. Dodd had had in his files since March, 1963, a year before his trip.

Mr. Stennis asked Mr. Dodd: "So with these immediate things on hand in the Senate and with the case itself stale and known about to the extent that I have noticed...and his imprisonment was to continue for some time, here is my major question: If Klein had no part in your trip to Europe, and the civil rights bill was not strong enough to hold you here at that time, what strength, demanding strength was there at that time in this Stashinsky case to take you away?"

Mr. Dodd said that "what was

important to me was to find out as much as I could about what really happened...and as soon as I could, make it known to the Congress and the Senate particularly, to the subcommittee and to the American people."

Mr. Bennett said that in view of "the emergency nature of that trip," he was surprised at the delay in the report and the "scantiness of the information" supplied by Mr. Dodd.

Mr. Dodd replied that the details of what he learned in the interview were not in the report but "in my mind."